UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,566	12/11/2006	Frank Hartung	P18484-US1	2820
27045 ERICSSON IN	7590 07/12/201 C.	EXAMINER		
6300 LEGACY	DRIVE	SU, SARAH		
M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2431	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/12/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/595,566	HARTUNG ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SARAH SU	2431	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	n the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 June 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION	TION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
 a)	y Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on whi have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensior under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than t may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	f). ich the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee n and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ned statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but pri (a) They raise new issues that would require further consider (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corres NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. Set 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowab 	
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) wind with the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,5-11,15-21,24 and 29. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	Il not be entered, or b) 🛛 will be entered and an explanation of
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but befo because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suffi was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	are or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered cient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and	me <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of th REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ne status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does See Continuation Sheet.	s NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/13. Other:	SB/08) Paper No(s)
/NATHAN FLYNN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431	/Sarah Su/ Examiner, Art Unit 2431

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The applicant has submitted claim amendments, and the examiner hereby withdraws the rejections to claims 1, 5-11, 15-21, 24, and 29 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner has found the applicant's arguments to be non-persuasive, and the examiner maintains the grounds of rejection.

As to claim 1, it is argued that Inoue does not communicate a usage right. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Inoue discloses that each of a restriction has a corresponding ID that is transmitted (0170, lines 12-20); therefore, the transmission of an ID communicates the corresponding usage right. It is also argued that Inoue does not refer to terminal-terminal rights communication. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner has interpreted a terminal as a device that communicates rights, which includes terminals and servers, as disclosed by Inoue (0170, lines 12-20).

Further, as to claim 1, it is argued that in the claimed invention, it is evident that not the same permission is passed between the devices, but subsets of previous permissions which are defined at respective sending devices. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner notes that defining a usage right as a subset of a first usage right has been interpreted as including defining the usage right as also being equal to the first usage right.